firing pin did not touch the cartridge until 400 pages after the narrative of arrest is regretable, because the Report clearly states this on page 179. Right

10.) Page 93 (15th line): Another regretable misinterpretation. You must have understood R-224 incorrectly. According to Dean's testimony (see "The Witnesses", page 505) he saw "a man" whom he did not recognize dart out and kill Oswald. He did not know this man was Ruby until Ruby had already been subdued. Another mistaken part of your account is that Dean is supposed by you to have said that he was "too far away to do anything except holler." It is not Dean who said this — it is the Report that says it. So the Report is in error, too, according to the Testimony in "The Witnesses".

11.) Page 96 (Lines 14 and 15) You have a wonderful book, and it is a shame, in my opinion, to leave yourself open to doubts if people check your "quotations" from the Report, because (while I am sure you do not intend to be misleading) it might appear at first glance that you are trying to mislead. For, the rifle without the scope was advertized for $12.78 in certain copies of the ad. I have some to show you if you doubt

But this was a scope!

2905 Longshore Avenue
Philadelphia, Pa. — 19149
October 6, 1966

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Must admit that I was disapointed in receiving no reply to my last letter. Perhaps you misunderstood my intentions when I called some parts of "Whitewash" which I believe are errors to your attention. But, since you did not indicate so by a reply, I now offer more of these "catches". I will not be able to check any further, since I have had to give my borrowed copy back, without the satisfaction of finishing it. I was afraid that would happen, and that is why I asked for an autographed copy from you.

In any case, here are some of the "errors" as I see them. I am not listing all that I "caught", for I do not know whether you are really interested in hearing from me. But, since I made a note of some of them, I will at least offer them for your inspection:

1.) Page 39 — (9th line from the bottom:) The Report, on page 5 says "one eyewitness" — not

"the one eyewitness". In fact, in the previous sentence, the Report says there were "several eyewitnesses", and on pages 64 and 147 it goes further and identifies Euin as such a witness. An error like this might appear to some to be deliberately misleading, and I call it to your attention in case there is a reprinting. I am only trying to help.

2.) Page 54. Cannot follow your logic on what you are attempting to prove because if Oswald had not gone in the wrong direction both to get the bus, and in directing the taxi past his quarters, he'd have been able to get home much sooner. In pursuing this line, you seem to be working against your own doubts about the possibility of his having time to reach Tippit, as far as the time element is concerned.

3.) Page 55. (2nd line from bottom): "Patton" is a mistake. You meant "Beckley".

4.) Page 56 (9th line from bottom): Again, you are in error on "Patton". This time it should read "10th Street".

5.) Page 57 (20 lines from bottom): Your reference to "R165" is wrong. Should read "R167".

6.) Page 60 (11th line from bottom): This error concerns Carroll — whose name is specifically mentioned by McDonald. See testimony on page 115 of "The Witnesses".

7.) Page 61 (1st line): Your reference to R-304 is confusing, since R-304 has nothing to do with the subject under discussion.

8.) Page 61 (Last paragraph): According to my interpretation, your paragraph is just not true. Carroll does not claim to disarm Oswald. As I read it, McDonald says he held the butt end of the gun and put it all the way out in the aisle, (thereby making it possible for Carroll to take it — from McDonald, not Oswald.) Carroll's version is that he saw this pistol pointing at him, so he simply reached out and pulled it away. These two accounts are in no way contradictory. McDonald was not intending to "point" it at Carroll, yet it is undoubtedly possible that it was nevertheless "pointing" at Carroll by chance. It had to be pointing somewhere since McDonald was holding it by the butt, keeping it out of Oswald's reach. Your claim that each claimed to have disarmed Oswald is simply not to be verified in any place I have been able to search.

9.) Page 62 (15th line): Your seeming inference that the Commission would not admit that the

this. Curry would seem to be misquoted by you, because the quote I read from him was that the ballistics tests were going to be favorable — not that they already were favorable. On R-234 there is no direct quote from him saying that the case is "wrapped up". Although this might sound like splitting hairs, my reason for harping on this is that I think your book is on the whole a much-needed document, and to get carried away by inferences in "quotation marks" would seem to me to give biased readers an excuse to condemn the book as a whole. Maybe it doesn't sound that way, but I write this only because, in my opinion, a revised and corrected edition would eliminate the possibility of such criticism of the book as a whole.

12) Page 105 (line 22) In spite of this, the Report says he saw the shootings (on page 155), and on page 64 the Report states that Euins "saw the man shoot again".

13) Page 105 (13th line from bottom): Another instance where critics could claim you are misleading the reader, for on page 158 of the Report, it shows that the Commission does not

claim or infer that Oswald rode the bus past the Depository. It shows the opposite on it's Chart. The statement in your book is not direct, yet it could be taken as a false inference by the manner in which it is written.

14.) Page 124 (12th line from bottom): You are misquoting by employing the word "about," according to my check. [illegible]

This is as far as I got when I had to return the book to it's owner. Since I am out of work and cannot collect compensation, that is the end of it for me, unless you would be good enough to fill my request for an autographed free copy.

I only hope you do not take my criticism in the wrong way. I repeat that it is intended to be helpful. Perhaps in some cases, I am wrong. However, were I in your position, I can honestly say that I would welcome someone pointing these things out — especially in the event that a new edition might eventually be put out. I truly hope you will see, therefore, that this detailed list of what I believe are errors in the present edition of "Whitewash" is intended by me solely as a gratuitous offer of "proof-reading" for you. My research has been fun, but also work. If you think my efforts are worth an autographed copy, I will treasure it. If not, I end this "correspondence," — so far very one-sided, — with congratulations for a highly interesting analysis, and with sincere best wishes for a brand-new success in a further printing.

Yours very truly —

JACK J. WAITE
2905 Longshore Ave.
Phila. Pa., 19149